

Rank, Review &
Recommendation
for HMIS Lead –
New Project

HMIS Lead

Committee Evaluator Scoring Review

September 24, 2015

Process

- Only committee members in attendance for both prospective leads included in scoring
- Members asked to rate presentations/RFP based upon seven distinct domains, weighted by varied number of criteria across domains
- Ratings for each item evaluated based upon a four point scale

Domains and Criteria *

Domain	Criteria
Data Quality	Timely response to data quality issues
Data Quality	Regular data quality monitoring
Data Quality	Monitor implementation of HMIS standards
Reporting	Ongoing monitoring and reporting of system outcomes
Reporting	Ability to present and communicate HMIS data quality, agency performance, and system outcomes
Reporting	Ability to explain key HUD data indicators in an understandable way across various media platforms
Reporting	High quality technical assistance
Reporting	Timely response to service and data requests
Training	High quality and individualized training of new users
Training	High quality ongoing and individualized training on data entry procedures and policies
Training	Ongoing training of agencies for data reporting and self-evaluation
Leadership	Leadership in developing and disseminating new data quality procedures
Leadership	Experience creating regional links across agencies and continua
Leadership	Capability to work with multiple software vendors
Leadership	Commitment to self-evaluation in lead activities
Leadership	Ability to involve broader community into continuum
Leadership	Ability to advocate for strong policies and practices
Compliance	Completes HUD required reports
Knowledge	Knowledge of HMIS standards
Knowledge	Present options for standard metrics of system and agency performance
Knowledge	Present options of policies and procedures to implement HUD standards and achieve system outcome targets
Customer Support	Ability to deal with complaints constructively
Customer Support	Friendly and helpful customer support for users, agencies, and leadership

*derived from HUD Exchange HMIS Lead checklist

Scoring Results

	ICA	MISI
Eval1	3.04	2.74
Eval2	3.35	3.70
Eval3	3.35	3.70
Eval4	3.04	2.52
Eval5	2.70	2.35
Eval6	3.59	3.43
Eval7	3.20	3.13
Straightline Average Score for 7 Evaluators		3.08

Scoring Results cont.

- 5 of 7 evaluators scored ICA higher with an average difference of .278
- 2 of 7 preferred MISI but with an average difference of .347

Scoring by Domain

Domain	ICA	MISI
Data Quality	3.57	3.26
Reporting	3.04	3.14
Training	3.17	3.05
Leadership	2.90	2.80
Compliance	3.43	3.57
Knowledge	3.52	3.29
Customer Support	3.14	3.00
Total	3.18	3.08

Additional Considerations

ICA	
Pros	<p>Long-term potential</p> <p>Broad software experience</p> <p>Good knowledge of HUD</p> <p>Connection with academics</p> <p>Will hire local trainers</p> <p>Strong leadership in CoCs</p> <p>Good transparency</p> <p>Amenable to data integration</p>
Cons	<p>More expensive--high start-up costs (we recommend negotiating down on those costs)</p> <p>Working on many new projects</p>
MISI	
Pros	<p>Less expensive</p> <p>We know them--Experienced with local service providers</p> <p>Offer personalized training</p> <p>Good knowledge of HUD</p> <p>Networking with non-CoC agencies in CoC</p> <p>Good report building</p> <p>Good transparency</p> <p>Connection with academics</p> <p>Amenable to data integration</p>
Cons	<p>Need proper resources</p> <p>History of inadequate reporting</p>